Wang") by and through their attorneys of record, and for their Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint,

hereby admit, deny, and aver as follows:

26

25

DEFENDANTS WANG AND MEN'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT: CASE NO. 2:23-CV-01395-JCC - 1

PDX\137206\280942\KJSC\37423567.1

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. Attorneys at Law 1420 5th Avenue, Suite 3400 Seattle, WA 98101-4010 Telephone: 206-622-1711

I. PARTIES

- 1. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph and therefore deny the same.
- 2. Defendants Wang admit they are married and residents of King County, Washington. All other allegations set forth in this paragraph are denied.
- 3. Upon information and belief, Defendants Wang admit the allegations set forth in this paragraph except that they are without information to either admit or deny whether Defendant Thorpe's actions were taken on behalf of his marital community, and therefore deny the same.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Defendants Wang admit the allegations set forth in this paragraph except that they are without information to either admit or deny whether Defendant Heck's actions were taken on behalf of his marital community, and therefore deny the same.
- 5. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph and therefore deny the same.
- 6. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph and therefore deny the same.
- 7. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph and therefore deny the same.
- 8. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph and therefore deny the same.
 - 9. Paragraph 9 of Plaintiff's Complaint does not require a response. To the extent

Defendants Wang must respond, they deny the same.

II. <u>JURISDICTION & VEN</u>UE

10. The allegations set forth in this paragraph do not require a response. To the extent Defendants Wang must respond, they deny the same.

III. MATERIAL FACTS

- 11. Defendants Wang admit that Ms. Wang has experience as a real estate developer in Seattle, but denies all other allegations set forth in this paragraph.
 - 12. Defendants Wang deny.
 - 13. Defendants Wang deny.
- 14. Defendants Wang admit Ms. Wang invested with Defendant Thorpe. All other allegations are denied.
- 15. Defendants Wang admit that Ms. Wang drove Plaintiff to Defendant Thorpe's office at the request of Plaintiff. All other allegations are denied.
- 16. Defendants Wang admit Ms. Wang forwarded a document from Defendant Thorpe at the parties' request, but deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph.
- 17. Defendants Wang admit she gave Plaintiff a ride to the business office of Defendant Northlake at Plaintiff's request. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations, and therefore, deny the same.
- 18. Defendants Wang admit that Defendant Thorpe and Defendant Heck met with Plaintiff on or about October 5, 2018. All other allegations are denied.
- 19. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore deny the same.

DEFENDANTS WANG AND MEN'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT: CASE NO. 2:23-CV-01395-JCC - 3

- 20. This allegations is directed to other defendants and as such no response is required. To the extent they must respond, Defendants Wang deny.
- 21. This allegations is directed to other defendants and as such no response is required. To the extent they must respond, Defendants Wang deny.
- 22. This allegations is directed to other defendants and as such no response is required. To the extent they must respond, Defendants Wang deny.
- 23. Defendants Wang admit Ms. Wang Ms. Wang drove Plaintiff to real property at 18110 Midvale Ave. N. Shoreline, WA 98133. All other allegations are denied.
- 24. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore deny the same.
- 25. This allegations is directed to other defendants and as such no response is required. To the extent they must respond, Defendants Wang deny.
- 26. Defendants Wang admit that Ms. Wang invested in the Project as an investor, but deny all remaining allegations.
- 27. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore deny the same.
- 28. Defendants Wang admit that on or about November 15, 2018, at the request of the parties, she forwarded information from Defendant Heck to Plaintiff. All other allegations are denied.
- 29. Defendants Wang admit on or about November 22, 2018 that she sent a WeChat message to Plaintiff but denies that the allegations in this paragraph are the full content of the messages exchanged.

50. Deteridants wang deny	30.	Defendants	Wang	deny
---------------------------	-----	------------	------	------

- 31. Defendants Wang admit that Ms. Wang forwarded a message to Plaintiff from Defendant Thorpe on or about November 23, 2018.
- 32. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore deny the same.
 - 33. Upon information and belief, Defendants Wang admit.
 - 34. Upon information and belief, Defendants Wang admit.
 - 35. Defendants Wang deny.
- 36. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore deny the same.
- 37. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore deny the same.
 - 38. Defendants Wang deny.
- 39. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore deny the same.
- 40. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore deny the same.
- 41. Defendants Wang admit that Plaintiff was informed on or about January 30, 2019 that the recording of her Deed of Trust had not yet occurred, but are without sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph.
- 42. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny and therefore deny the same.

- 43. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny and therefore deny the same.
 - 44. Defendants Wang deny.
- 45. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny and therefore deny the same.
 - 46. Defendants Wang deny.
- 47. Defendants Wang admits Ms. Wang invested \$20,000 in the 5326 Roosevelt Way project and deny all other allegations in this paragraph.
 - 48. Defendants Wang deny.
- 49. Defendants Wang assert this allegation is directed to other defendants and as such no answer is required. To the extent they must respond, Defendants Wang admit the allegations upon information and belief.
- 50. Defendants Wang assert this allegation is directed to other defendants and as such no answer is required. To the extent they must respond, Defendants Wang deny the same.
- 51. Defendants Wang assert this allegation is directed to other defendants and as such no answer is required. To the extent they must respond, Defendants Wang deny the same.
 - 52. Upon information and belief, Defendants Wang admit.
 - 53. Defendants Deny.
- 54. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore, deny the same.
- 55. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore, deny the same.

- 56. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore, deny the same.
- 57. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to admit or deny, and therefore, deny the same.

IV. CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF CONTRACT

- 58. Defendants Wang reassert their responses to Paragraphs 1-57 as if fully set forth herein.
- 59. The allegations set forth in this paragraph do not pertain to Defendants Wang, and therefore, no response is required. To the extent Defendants must respond, they deny the same.
- 60. The allegations set forth in this paragraph do not pertain to Defendants Wang, and therefore, no response is required. To the extent Defendants must respond, they deny the same.
- 61. The allegations set forth in this paragraph do not pertain to Defendants Wang, and therefore, no response is required. To the extent Defendants must respond, they deny the same.
- 62. The allegations set forth in this paragraph do not pertain to Defendants Wang, and therefore, no response is required. To the extent Defendants must respond, they deny the same.
- 63. The allegations set forth in this paragraph do not pertain to Defendants Wang, and therefore, no response is required. To the extent Defendants must respond, they deny the same.

DEFENDANTS WANG AND MEN'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT: CASE NO. 2:23-CV-01395-JCC - 7

64. The allegations set forth in this paragraph do not pertain to Defendants Wang, and therefore, no response is required. To the extent Defendants must respond, they deny the same.

V. <u>CAUSE OF ACTION – VIOLATIONS OF THE WASHINGTON STATE</u> <u>SECURITIES ACT</u>

- 65. Defendants Wang reassert their responses to Paragraphs 1 through 64, as if fully set forth herein.
- 66. Paragraph 66 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent Defendants Wang must respond, they deny the same.
 - 67. Defendants Wang deny.
- 68. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph, and therefore deny the same.
- 69. Paragraph 69 a through c contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent Defendants Wang must respond, they deny the same.
- 70. Paragraph 70 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent Defendants Wang must respond, they deny the same.
- 71. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph and therefore deny the same.

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION – VIOLATIONS OF WASHINGTON'S CONSUMER PROTECTION

- 72. Defendants Wang reassert their responses to Paragraphs 1 through 71, as if fully set forth herein.
- 73. Paragraph 73 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To DEFENDANTS WANG AND MEN'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT:

 CASE NO. 2:23-CV-01395-JCC 8

 Paragraph 73 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. Attorneys at Law 1420 5th Avenue, Suite 3400 Seattle, WA 98101-44010 Telephone: 206-622-1711

the extent Defendants Wang must respond, they deny the same.

74. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph and therefore deny the same.

VII. <u>CAUSE OF ACTION – NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION</u>

- 75. Defendants Wang reassert their responses to Paragraphs 1 through 74, as if fully set forth herein.
- 76. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph, and therefore deny the same.
- 77. Defendants Wang deny as to Defendant Wang and are without sufficient information as to the other Defendants.
- 78. Defendants Wang deny as to Defendant Wang and are without sufficient information as to the other Defendants.
- 79. Paragraph 79 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent that Defendants Wang must respond, they deny the same.
- 80. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph, and therefore deny the same.
- 81. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph, and therefore deny the same.

VIII. CAUSE OF ACTION – INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION

- 82. Defendants Wang reassert their responses to Paragraphs 1 through 81, as if fully set forth herein.
- 83. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the DEFENDANTS WANG AND MEN'S ANSWER TO
 PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT:

 CASE NO. 2:23-CV-01395-JCC 9

 SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. Attorneys at Law 1420 5th Avenue, Suite 3400 Seattle, WA 98101-4010 Telephone: 206-622-1711

allegations set forth in this paragraph, and therefore deny the same.

- 84. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph, and therefore deny the same.
- 85. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph, and therefore deny the same.
- 86. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph, and therefore deny the same.
- 87. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph, and therefore deny the same.
- 88. Defendants Wang are without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations set forth in this paragraph, and therefore deny the same.

IX. CAUSE OF ACTION – UNJUST ENRICHMENT

- 89. Defendants Wang reassert their responses to Paragraphs 1 thought 88, as if fully set forth herein.
- 90. Paragraph 90 contains a legal conclusions to which no response is required, to the extent that Defendants Wang must respond, Defendants Wang deny the same.
- 91. Paragraph 91 contains a legal conclusions to which no response is required, to the extent that Defendants Wang must respond, Defendants Wang deny the same.
- 92. Paragraph 92 contains a legal conclusions to which no response is required, to the extent that Defendants Wang must respond, Defendants Wang deny the same.
- 93. Paragraph 90 contains a legal conclusions to which no response is required, to the extent that Defendants Wang must respond, Defendants Wang deny the same.

DEFENDANTS WANG AND MEN'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT: CASE NO. 2:23-CV-01395-JCC - 10

X. <u>RESERVATION</u>

94. Paragraph 94 does not require a response by these Answering Defendants. To the extent they must respond, Defendants Wang deny the same.

XI. RELIEF REQUESTED

Defendants Wang deny Plaintiff's Relief Request, paragraphs 1-4, in its entirety.

XII. <u>AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES</u>

- 1. Plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.
- 2. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of laches.
- 3. Plaintiff's claims are barred in part or completely by the doctrine of estoppel.
- 4. Plaintiff's claims are barred in party or completely by his own contributory negligence.
 - 5. Plaintiff's claims are barred under the doctrine of waiver.
 - 6. Plaintiff's claims are barred in part or completely by the statute of frauds.
 - 7. Plaintiff's claims are barred in part of completely by the doctrine of offset.
- 8. Plaintiff's claims are barred in part or completely by the applicable statutes of limitations.
- 9. Plaintiff's claims are barred in part or completely due to his failure to mitigate damages.
- 10. Plaintiff's claims are barred in part or completely due to intervening and superseding causation.
- 11. Plaintiff's claims are barred in part or completely as a result of Plaintiff intentionally or negligently destroying evidence before defendants have an opportunity to DEFENDANTS WANG AND MEN'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT:

 CASE NO. 2:23-CV-01395-JCC 11

24

25

26

examine the evidence.

12. Plaintiff's claims are barred in part or completely under the doctrine of accord and satisfaction.

Defendants Wang reserve all rights under law to assert future and additional affirmative defenses to Plaintiff's claims as further investigation and discovery progresses.

XIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

- 1. For dismissal of Plaintiff's complaint, with prejudice;
- 2. For an award of Defendants Wang's costs and attorney fees to the fullest extent permitted by law; and
 - 3. For such other relief the Court deems just and equitable.

Dated this 15th day of September, 2023.

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

By: /s/ David R. Ebel
David R. Ebel, WSBA #28853
Email: debel@schwabe.com
Karleen J. Scharer, WSBA #48101
Email: kscharer@schwabe.com
1420 5th Avenue, Suite 3400
Seattle, WA 98101-4010
Telephone: 206-622-1711
Facsimile: 206-292-0460
Attorneys for Defendants Shu-Mei Wang

and Beijing Men

DEFENDANTS WANG AND MEN'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT: CASE NO. 2:23-CV-01395-JCC - 12

PDX\137206\280942\KJSC\37423567.1

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. Attorneys at Law 1420 5th Avenue, Suite 3400 Seattle, WA 98101-4010 Telephone: 206-622-1711

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 2 I hereby certify that on the 15th day of September, 2023, I caused to be served the 3 foregoing DEFENDANTS WANG AND MEN'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S 4 COMPLAINT on the following parties via the CM/ECF system for the US District Court, 5 Western District of Washington: 6 Daniel J. Frohlich, WSBA #31437 Danial D. Pharris, WSBA # 13617 DICKSON FROHLICH PHILLIPS Paul J. Spadafora, WSBA # 49777 7 BURGESS, PLLC LASHER HOLZAPFEL 2101 4th Avenue, Suite 700 SPERRY EBBERSON PLLC Seattle, WA 98121 8 2600 Two Union Square dfrohlich@dfpblaw.com 601 Union Street 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff Seattle, WA 98101 pharris@lasher.com 10 spadafora@lasher.com Attorneys for Defendants James 11 Thorpe, Kimberly Thorpe, Seth Heck, Northlake Capital and 12 Development, LLC, 183rd Shoreline Apartments, LLC, 5326 Roosevelt 13 Way, LLC and 4206 7th Ave LLC 14 15 16 17 /s/ David R. Ebel David R. Ebel, WSBA #28853 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE - 1

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. Attorneys at Law 1420 5th Avenue, Suite 3400 Seattle, WA 98101-4010 Telephone: 206-622-1711